UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,661	09/16/2005	Kyung-Hee Park	YPL-0173	2189

23413 7590 03/09/2009

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103

EXAMINER	
GOLDBERG, JEANINE ANNE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1634	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/09/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/549,661	PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEANINE A. GOLDBERG	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/10/08*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7,8 and 11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7,8 and 11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to papers filed December 10, 2008. Claims 7-8, 11 are pending and are under examination on the merits.

2. All arguments have been thoroughly reviewed but are deemed non-persuasive for the reasons which follow.

3. Any objections and rejections not reiterated below are hereby withdrawn.

   a. The 112/2nd rejections have been withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments to the claims.

4. This action is FINAL.

Election/Restrictions

5. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 7-9, and SEQ ID NO:5, having the G allele at the polymorphic site position 101 is acknowledged.

6. It is noted that the subject matter of the nonelected inventions has been cancelled by Applicants.

Priority

7. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on applications filed in Korea on 2/2/04 and 2/1805. It is noted, however, that a certified copy of each of the foreign applications has not been filed as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

It is noted that a translation of the foreign document has not been received.

The response asserts that the Korean patent applications have been provided to the USPTO by the IB. The response provides a copy of the PCT/IB/304 to document that certified copies of the two priority applications were indeed received by the IB. This argument has been reviewed but is not persuasive. Upon review of the document provided by Applicant, the examiner notes that the first Korean document was "NR" which indicates "not received". Thus, the evidence provided does not appear to support that the applications were indeed received by the IB as argued by the response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 Enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 7-8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The test of enablement is whether one skilled in the art could make and use the claimed invention from the disclosures in the application coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation (*United States v. Teletronics Inc*, 8 USPQ2d 1217 (Fed Cir. 1988)). Whether undue experimentation is needed is not based on a single factor, but rather a conclusion reached by weighing many factors (See *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986)) and *In re Wands* 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

The breadth of the claims and nature of the invention

Claims 7-8 are drawn to a method of determining risk of developing colorectal cancer, which comprises: determining in a nucleic acid sample from a Korean human the nucleotide base at polymorphic site at position 101 of SEQ ID NO 5 and determining risk of developing colorectal cancer in the human wherein determining the base is G indicates an increased risk of developing colorectal cancer compared to determining the base is T.

Claim 11 is directed to further comprising determining a genotype in the sample to analyze homozygosity vs herterozygosity.

Guidance in the Specification and Working Examples

The specification teaches studying an association between the position 101 polymorphism in SEQ ID NO: 5 and colorectal cancer (pg 4). The specification teaches performing DNA nucleotide sequence analysis on blood collected from Korean colorectal cancer patients and normal persons (pg 4). The specification teaches in

Table 1 that the CCY_041 SNP has an odds ratio of 1.52, a confidence interval of 1.182 and 1.961 and a chi-square value of 4.62 $x10^{-3}$. The specification teaches in example 1 that the patients were 300 Korean colorectal cancer patients and 300 Korean controls (see page 11). The data provided in Table 1 is not clear whether the statistics is related to the allele frequency data or the genotype frequency. The implications of the statistics are different and the specification does not clearly demonstrate both allele and genotypes are significantly associated with colorectal cancer.

The unpredictability of the art, the state of the prior art, level of skill in the art

While the state of the art and level of skill in the art with regard to correlating polymorphisms with disease state is high, the level of unpredictability in associating any polymorphism with a particular disease state is even higher. The level of unpredictability is demonstrated by the prior art, the post filing art, and the instant specification.

Regarding using polymorphisms to make predictions, the art teaches genetic variations and associations are often irreproducible. Hirschhorn (Hirschhorn et al. Genetics in Medicine. Vol. 4, No. 2, pages 45-61, March 2002) teaches that most reported associations are not robust. Of the 166 associations studied three or more times, only 6 have been consistently replicated. Hirschhorn suggests a number of reasons for the irreproducibility of studies, suggesting population stratification, linkage disequilibrium, gene-gene or gene-environment interactions, and weak genetic effects and lack of power are possible factors that lead to such irreproducibility. Hirschhorn et

al. caution that the current irreproducibility of most association studies should raise a cautionary alarm when considering their use as diagnostics and prognostics (p. 60, Col. 2). Thus, Hirschhorn cautions in drawing conclusions from a single report of an association between a genetic variant and disease susceptibility.

Quantity of Experimentation

Claims 7-8 are drawn to a method of determining risk of developing colorectal cancer, which comprises: determining in a nucleic acid sample from a Korean human the nucleotide base at polymorphic site at position 101 of SEQ ID NO 5 and determining risk of developing colorectal cancer in the human wherein determining the base is G indicates an increased risk of developing colorectal cancer compared to determining the base is T. The final process step of determining a risk of developing colorectal cancer by determining the G or T allele does not clearly provide any guidance for the heterozygote individuals who possess both a G and T. Based upon the genotype frequency, more than half of the individuals are heterozygous. Are these individuals at risk for developing colorectal cancer? Claim 11 appears more closely drawn to illustrating that a GT is at increased risk, however the individuals possess a T also. Therefore, it is unpredictable that increased risk can be determined by the mere presence of a G compared to a T because heterozygotes carry both the G and T alleles.

Moreover, the data provided in Table 1 does not clearly provide what results are obtained. The Table contains allele frequencies and genotype frequencies and statistics, however it is unclear what data was analyzed with respect to the statistics.

While the data yields a p-value of 0.00462 it is unclear what had been compared, i.e. gentoype or allele frequencies.

Conclusion

Thus given the claims in an art whose nature is unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the research required to define these unpredictable variables, the lack of guidance provided in the specification, and the negative teachings in the prior art balanced only against the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to perform the methods of the claims as broadly written.

Response to Arguments

The response traverses the rejection. The response asserts the specification is fully enabled as evidenced by the association study, that the alleles of the SNP at position 101 of SEQ ID NO: 5 are associated with an increased risk of developing colorectal cancer in a Korean human. This argument has been considered but is not convincing because as questioned in the enablement rejection, it is unclear whether the statistics, analyzed the genotype, i.e. GG, GT or TT status or whether the statistics analyze the allele status, i.e. G or T. The response does not appear to address this confusion. In fact, the response states that the p-value related to comparing genotype frequency, but in the same sentence uses the probability of risk allele. Thus, it is unclear what the data presented illustrates.

Furthermore, as noted above, there is no guidance how a heterozygote who has both a G and T allele would be evaluated. The determining risk step does not make sense if a person has both a G and T allele. It would be unclear how the determination of a G indicates an increased risk of developing colorectal cancer compared to the T, since the one individual posses both alleles.

Thus for the reasons above and those already of record, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Jeanine Goldberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-0743. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571) 272-0735.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The Central Fax Number for official correspondence is (571) 273-8300.

/Jeanine Goldberg/
Primary Examiner
March 5, 2009